

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 1-13 and 17 are pending in the current application. In the final Office Action dated March 12, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 7,383,127 ("Matsuo"); rejected claims 2, 5, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuo; rejected claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuo in view of U.S. Pat. No. 4,914,605 ("Loughmiller"); rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuo in view of what the Examiner asserts is admitted prior art; and rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuo in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0156739 ("Hirari"). Finally, the Examiner indicated that claim 17 is in condition for allowance.

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1-3 and 12. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

II. Matsuo Does Not Render Claim 1 Unpatentable

Amended independent claim 1 recites an image combining unit operable to display a map image inside a window and a simple image of at least two main roads outside of the window on the monitor screen, wherein the map image in the window is presented in greater detail than the simple map image located outside the window. Matsuo fails to teach this element.

Matsuo is directed to a navigation apparatus for receiving delivered information. The Examiner asserts that Fig. 8 of Matsuo illustrates a presentation of a simple image of a main road extending outside a window. Fig. 8 and the corresponding discussion in Col. 11, lines 49-61 of Matsuo teach that a navigation apparatus may present a map illustrating an area around a current position of a vehicle (reference numeral 3000), an area around a destination of the vehicle (reference numeral 3010), and a recommended route (reference numeral 3020) extending from the current position of the vehicle to the destination. While Applicant may not agree with the Examiner that the recommended route extending outside a map image of Matsuo is equivalent to a main road outside a

window, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite at least two main roads outside of the window. Matsuo fails to teach two recommended routs (the purported main road) extending outside a map image.

Matsuo fails to teach an image combining unit operable to display a map image inside a window and a simple image of at least two main roads outside of the window on the monitor screen, wherein the map image in the window is presented in greater detail than the simple map image located outside the window. For at least this reason, Matsuo does not anticipate, or render obvious, amended independent claim 1 or any claim that depends on claim 1. For at least this same reason, the proposed combinations of Matsuo and Loughmiller do not render amended independent claim 1, or any claim that depends on claim 1, unpatentable

III. Matsuo Does Not Render Claim 12 Unpatentable

Amended independent claim 12 recites a simple image portion of a monitor screen external to a window portion operable to display a simple image of at least two main roads extending outside a window. As discussed above in conjunction with claim 1, Matsuo fails to teach two recommended routs (the purported main road) extending outside a map image. Accordingly, Matsuo fails to teach the above-recited element of claim 12. For at least this reason, Matsuo does not anticipate, or render obvious, amendment independent claim 12 or any claim that depends on claim 12. For at least this same reason, the proposed combination of Matsuo and Hirari does not render amended independent claim 12, or any claim that depends on claim 12, unpatnetable.

IV. Conclusion

In light of the amendments to the claims and the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition of allowance. Reconsideration is therefore respectfully requested. If there are any questions concerning this Amendment, the Examiner is asked to phone the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott W. Brim
Registration No. 51,500
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200